

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending.

I. Drawing Objections:

The Examiner objected to the drawings because they do not show the all of Applicant's claim limitations. To address this concern, the Applicant has added a new Figure 6D, which in flow chart form illustrates the method of claim 1. Other aspects in the dependent claims are already illustrated in other Figures.

Amendments to the specification have also been made which make reference to this new Figure 6D. None of these amendments to the specification or the drawings comprise new matter.

II. Specification Objections:

The various typographical errors noted by the Examiner have been fixed.

Also, as concerns the Examiner's comments about trademarks, Applicant's specification inconspicuously notes all trademarks (such as by using a "R in a circle"), and so it appears that the specification respects third-party trademark rights and that further amendments to the specification are unnecessary.

III. Enablement Rejection:

Claim 14 was rejected for lack of enablement, but has been amended to address the Examiner's concern.

IV. Indefiniteness Rejections:

Claims 3 and 9 have been rejected for indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Any ambiguity has been fixed by appropriate amendment to these claims.

V. Rejections Over the Prior Art:

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of independent claim 1. As the Examiner will appreciate, should independent claim 1 be patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims 2-14 would also necessarily be patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

Claim 1 has been rejected for anticipation (35 U.S.C. § 102(b)) in light of USP 5,000,194 ("Honert"). Claim 1 has also been rejected for obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103) given the combination of USP 6,162,101 ("Fischer") with Honert.

Claim 1 has been amended to essentially incorporate the limitation of claim 2 (now canceled), namely that the ends of the conducting wire(s) is/are coupled to the electrical contact(s) "via a printed circuit board."

The Examiner considered this limitation obvious in light of Honert alone in his rejection of original claim 2. See Office Action at pages 8-9, ¶ 12. In so doing, the Examiner faults the Applicant's specification for failing to tout the benefits or improvements of using a printed circuit board as the connective structure in a connector pin. In other words, rather than relying on the prior art and evidence of what would have been the understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art, the Examiner relies on Applicant's own specification to prove obviousness. But it is clearly not correct to use Applicant's specification to prove obviousness. See MPEP § 2143.01 (I) (Title) ("The Prior Art Must Suggest the Desirability of the Claimed Invention); *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1138 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ("The invention must be viewed **not with the blueprint drawn by the inventor**, but in the state of the art that existed at the time.").

The Examiner also considers that "one of ordinary skill in the art . . . would have expected the pin of Honert and Applicant's invention to work equally well with either the PCB [printed circuit board] or the wires connected directly to the contacts, because both would perform the same function of electrically connecting the wires and contacts equally well." But this merely makes the point that the direct connection or connection via a PCB can work equally well in a connector pin, which alone is not sufficient to prove obviousness. See MPEP § 2143.01 (II), (III) (fact that a reference can functionally be modified is not sufficient to establish obviousness without evidence of suggestion or motivation to make the modification; mere fact that invention is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art is not sufficient to establish obviousness).

In short, the Examiner's stated rationales for the obviousness of original claim 2 (now claim 1) are not sustainable. As a result, claim 1, and claims dependent thereon, should be allowable.

* * * * *

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1 and 3-14 are allowable, and requests that a Notice of Allowance issue for these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Terril Lewis /

Terril Lewis, Reg. No. 46,065

Date: August 21, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 29855

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Bruculeri, L.L.P.,
20333 SH 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
832/446-2405
Fax 832/446-2424